

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XII. No. 14.] LONDON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1807. [PRICE 10D.]

"The Adam and Eve of this young nation came out of Newgate."—Saying of a British Grenadier in 1776.

513]

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

DOMINION OF THE SEAS (continued from p. 422).—Upon this subject, there was a letter, from a correspondent, inserted in the Register of the 19th of September, at page 429, which letter I should have answered, in my last, had it not been done in so able and complete a manner by my correspondent WROC, of Lincoln's Inn, whose admirable letter will be found at page 502. Thus is the ground of "occupancy, or first possession," completely demolished. —A second correspondent, under the name of CANDIDUS, at page 506, takes up the same subject, and he differs from me merely upon the propriety of my definition of *law*; but, he has not, I think, satisfactorily shewn, that it is proper to denominate *law* that which no tribunal can possibly enforce. "A law," says he, "is a rule of action, and I apprehend, that a conscientious man may lay down for himself a rule of conduct, from which he will not deviate, though there should be no tribunal that could enforce his obedience." Very true, but, this is using the word *law* in a figurative sense; and, as to the *force* of such a law, as applied to the affairs of nations, it would, I think, be very difficult to discover, in the history of the world, any, even the slightest, traces of it. My correspondent says, that, "as to the tribunal for enforcing these rules, the *interest* of the *whole* creates such a tribunal, by producing a *confederacy of the different states* for that purpose." But, here we revert to *might* again, to force, to mere power, to the "right of the strongest;" and, as I explicitly said before, the *only* defence of weak states consists in the opposite interests and the mutual jealousies of the strong ones.—With respect to the present state of things, however, Candidus agrees with me, that one power having swallowed up all the others, upon the continent of Europe, the law of nations, or the rules of conduct, were, from that moment, at an end, and that no state can *now* be called upon to act according to those rules.—But, the chief reason for my reverting to this subject, at this time, was, that I thought

[514

it necessary to notice an article published in the Morning Chronicle of the 21st of September, which article I shall, according to a custom almost peculiar to myself, first submit to the perusal of the reader.—"A great deal of *most unfounded clamour* has been raised against the late Ministers, not only as having been willing to concede, but as having actually conceded, some of our most important naval rights to the Americans. We venture to assert most positively, however, that in the Treaty concluded in this country in the end of last, or beginning of the present year, not a single naval claim is conceded, and that particularly the right of searching for seamen is not given up. With respect to searching for seamen on board of ships of war, it neither has been exercised, nor, from the nature of things, can it be exercised, without necessarily leading to disturbance and irritation that would render peace between two countries little else than a feverish expectation of actual war. Regulations may be requisite to prevent the seduction of our seamen by the Americans, but the identity of language, &c. which renders regulation necessary, would render the right of search on board of ships of war the worst possible remedy for the evil complained of.—We have contended that on this, as well as other points arising out of what we have been silly enough to call the Laws of Nations, nations were to be considered, as to their rights, as on a footing of equality. For this position we have been assailed in that ill-mannered tone of personal invective, which now disgraces political discussion. We have been accused of giving up the rights of the country, and advocating the cause of our enemies. Nay, the House of Lords itself, is censured for not having negatived a motion, that nations were entitled to be considered as equal, as to their rights.—Such extravagant language is perfectly suited to those who contend that there is no law, by sea or land, but that of the strongest, and who admit Bonaparte's right to subdue the Continent, because he is able to do it,

P

" and recommend that Great Britain should
 " exact tribute from every ship that sails
 " the sea, because she is able to do it. Our
 " readers, however, cannot suppose that
 " such doctrines ever were held by any
 " statesman or politician, or are likely to
 " be acted upon. The equality of nations
 " as to their rights, so far from being a new
 " or dangerous doctrine, is the doctrine by
 " which we have a Court of Admiralty
 " which determines causes by that very Law
 " of Nations which is called unmeaning
 " jargon. We can have no better authority
 " for this than Sir W. Scott, and those who
 " have been so loudly reviling us, have
 " in reality been attacking the principles of
 " that learned and respectable Judge.—
 " In giving judgment in the case of the
 " Maria (the case of the Swedish convoy),
 " Sir William Scott says, "In forming that
 " judgment, I trust that it has not one mo-
 " ment escaped my anxious recollection
 " what it is that the duty of my station
 " calls from me; namely, to consider
 " myself as stationed here not to deliver
 " occasional and shifting opinions to
 " serve present purposes of particular
 " national interest, but to administer
 " with indifference that justice which the
 " law of nations holds out, without dis-
 " tinction, to independent states, some
 " happening to be neutral and some to
 " be belligerent. The seat of judicial
 " authority is indeed locally here, in the
 " belligerent country, according to the
 " known law and practice of nations.
 " But the law itself has no locality. It
 " is the duty of the person who sits here,
 " to determine this question exactly as
 " he would determine the same question
 " if sitting at Stockholm; to assert no
 " pretensions on the part of Great Bri-
 " tain which he could not allow to Swe-
 " den in the same circumstances, and to
 " impose no duties upon Sweden as a
 " neutral country, which he would not ad-
 " mit to belong to Great Britain in the
 " same character." Here is the opinion
 " of Sir Wm. Scott distinctly in favour of
 " the equality of nations. Mr. Cobbett
 " reprobates the mention of such an equa-
 " lity. The judicious reader may chuse
 " which he likes best. We cannot help
 " hinting, however, that if Mr. Cobbett's
 " authority prevail, the Admiralty Court
 " may be forthwith abolished, and divers
 " placemen cashiered.—We humbly ap-
 " prehend therefore, and with great de-
 " ference to Mr. Cobbett's deep learning,
 " who judiciously quotes the trite and com-
 " mon-place Tory principle, that this coun-

" try should affect naval dominion, and not
 " fight upon the Continent, in order to
 " establish the right of this country to
 " universal naval property and dominion.
 " The sweeping claims now made to the
 " dominion of the sea is quite a different
 " thing, and aims at different consequences
 " from the old maxim of cultivating naval
 " power, in contradiction generally to land
 " force. At no time has this country claim-
 " ed that dominion or property now talked
 " of, and so strangely confounded with
 " the encouragement of naval strength.
 " We never claimed more than a sort of
 " nominal superiority, confined entirely
 " to the narrow seas, which by the Treaty
 " with the Dutch in 1674, extending them
 " as far as could be dreamt of, were defined
 " to be the seas from Cape Finisterre to Cape
 " Stat (in Norway). To this claim France ne-
 " ver yielded, and America of course had
 " nothing to do with it; but even this
 " claim, if admitted to its fullest extent;
 " if revived by a treaty containing the clause
 " left out in 1802, is utterly foreign to the
 " right claimed all the world over. Selden
 " himself offers as an argument in favour of
 " our British seas, that others have similar
 " rights in their seas, as the Venetians in
 " the Adriatic, and the Danes in the North;
 " and he is very well satisfied with being
 " able to make out a claim of a servitude
 " in our favour over the seas belonging to
 " the Danish sovereignty. To talk then of our
 " ancient sovereignty of the seas is an abuse
 " of the words. Indeed, though we had
 " always claimed and obtained this sove-
 " reignty in the sense now alluded to, of
 " a sovereignty over the whole ocean, it would
 " avail nothing; for even when admitted
 " in the narrow seas, it never has enabled
 " us to exert the right of searching ships of
 " war. If any proof of this were wanting,
 " we might refer to the demand made by
 " Cromwell, in 1653, after a war ostensi-
 " bly entered in for the honours of the flag,
 " and really originating in naval jealousy; a
 " war, too, in which he had beat the Dutch
 " in seven great sea-fights. He demand-
 " ed, as the ne plus ultra of maritime claims,
 " a right to visit Dutch ships of war in the
 " British seas. The Dutch, almost ruined,
 " and eager for peace, gave him all he
 " asked, except this; this they positively
 " refused, and the treaty 1654 was accord-
 " ingly made without any such stipulation,
 " though it yielded the honours of the
 " flag in the narrow seas as fully as possible.
 " —If Sir W. Scott has now discovered
 " the right of searching ships of war (which
 " we do not believe he has), most certain-

ly it is a recent discovery.—He never hinted at any such right in discussing the affair of the Swedish Convoy, in the case above alluded to. He confines his argument solely to the right of searching merchantmen, and denies that the merchantship can lawfully refuse to be searched. He goes on further than denying that the presence of the ship of war can legally prevent the search of the merchantmen. The searching of ships of war (and in such a case, on Sir W. Scott's authority, the right must be mutual), can never be resorted to between the English and Americans without nourishing heart-burnings and enmities, of which surely it is both humane and wise to remove the causes. Besides, if we retain the right of searching merchantmen, what possible inconvenience can arise while America is a neutral power, and has scarcely any military navy at sea at all, from waiving the right to search ships of war? What is the number of our sailors that can be detained in the American ships of war? even if their whole crew were English, the number would not be very great. If, then, we have a right to search their merchantmen, how can they in the present circumstances rob us with impunity of our sailors? The right of searching ships of war, therefore, is now at least of very little importance to us; but, on the other hand if the right is claimed by us, it must be conceded to the Americans; and in that case, we apprehend that the American ships of war in exercising the right of searching our men of war, would probably find a good many. But in retaining and exercising the right of searching merchantmen, we must say with Sir W. Scott, that, considering the invidiousness of such a proceeding, in all cases, and particularly to the Americans, almost in their own harbours, "The right must unquestionably be exercised with as little of personal harshness, and of vexation in the mode, as possible." It is not very likely that it will be so exercised when so much pains are taken to raise both the contempt and the hatred of our navy against the Americans.—

To take these observations in their order, I will first say, that I know of no clamour that has been raised against the late ministers, on account of concessions made by them to the Americans; but, I expressed my fears, that they had made such concessions; and, these fears were greatly increased by the tone which Mr. Whitbread took, at the moment the affair of the Chesapeake

was made known in England. It was the Whigs and the Morning Chronicle, who began the dispute here; they explicitly condemned the conduct of our naval officers upon the American station; it appeared to me, that the conduct of these officers was not only justifiable, but highly praise-worthy; and, in defending them, I was naturally led to examine the principles of those, by whom that condemnation had been passed. These principles I found to be subversive of our rights upon the seas, and I again expressed my fears, that some of those rights had been sacrificed, in the treaty, recently made with the American States. If they have not been sacrificed I am glad of it, but, however angry it may make the Morning Chronicle, I shall not ascribe the prevention of such sacrifice to its particular friends, but to the Grenville part of the late administration.—I am not aware, that I have assailed the Morning Chronicle in "an ill-mannered tone of personal invective;" but, what, other "than an advocate of the cause of our enemies," am I to call a writer, or a speaker, who *invariably*, is on the enemy's side? Who, in every dispute between America and Great Britain, has taken part with the former, though it is notorious, that America has taken every advantage that presented itself of shewing its hatred of us, and of evading the effect of stipulations that were intended to operate in our favour; and that, the people of England have to pay millions of money out of their taxes, owing to this conduct on the part of America. In spite of all this, as well known to the Morning Chronicle as to me, and I have at hand proofs of the facts, that paper has been constantly on the side of the Americans, and has censured every thing, said or done, by any body in the way of asserting our country's rights or claims, if those rights or claims were opposed to the interests of the Americans. What, else, then, than an advocate of the cause of our enemies am I to call such a print? "Nay," says this writer, "the House of Lords itself is censured for not having negatived a motion, that nations were to be considered as equal, as to their rights." Their rights upon the seas was what I remarked upon. That all nations were upon a footing of perfect equality as to the rights upon the seas, was the proposition of Lord Stanhope. And how did I censure the conduct of the peers in not putting a direct negative upon this? "in my opinion, said I, they should have met the question, and given a direct negative to the proposition." Does the Morning

Chronicle call this *censure*? Was this so galling to his ardent loyalty and love of "social order," as to induce him to point me out to the attention of the Attorney General? There is no one so unjust, or so implacable, as a defeated disputant.—But, now as to my so much derided doctrine: "as to the right of searching for seamen on board of ships of war, it neither has been, nor from the nature of things, can be exercised, without leading to disturbance and irritation that would render peace between two countries little else than a feverish expectation of war." My "*learning*," at which the Morning Chronicle is pleased to sneer, whether "deep" or shallow, is sufficient to enable me to assert, without the fear of being contradicted, that this right has, when we thought necessary, been exercised for centuries past, and that we have lived in perfect harmony with the powers, with respect to whom we have actually exercised it.—Nothing is, by this candid writer, said about *the order*, which all our naval commanders have, to search *all ships*, without exception, for British seamen; nor until the question was agitated by me, does he appear to have known, that such an order was in existence. "*Learning*," Sir, properly so called, is *knowledge*; and, if I happen to know more than you, with regard to the subject upon which we are writing, I am, as to that subject, a more learned man, though my skin may be spotless, and though you may still bear about you the marks of the blows, under which you acquired the knowledge of declining Latin nouns.—The proposition, that all nations are upon a footing of perfect equality, as to their rights upon the seas, is what I deny, and I have shewn before; that it is a proposition, not only unnecessary to be declared, but a proposition containing an abandonment of the ancient claims of our country. "The law of nations" is cited upon me by this antagonist. But, why should not Selden's admirable book, sanctioned as it was by republicans as well as royalists, be considered as part of the code of public law? Why are we to rely upon Grotius, in answer to whom Selden wrote, more than we are to rely upon our own learned and excellent countryman? I should like to have a direct answer to this question. The book of Grotius contains merely the opinions of an individual; and, surely, Selden's opinions are full as good, considered as a rule of conduct for us.—But, this writer, as if overjoyed to have discovered a lapse in the claims of his country, hastens to tell us, that "we

"never claimed more than a sort of nominal superiority, confined entirely to the narrow seas, which, by the treaty with the Dutch, in 1674, extending them as far as could be dreamt of, were defined to be the seas from Cape Finisterre to Cape Stat. To this claim France never yielded, and America" (dear America!) "of course had nothing to do with it."—And why of course? Because she was not then an independent nation? That is a poor reason; for, when she did become independent, she became a sharer in all the checks which England possessed the right of imposing upon the operations of other nations upon the seas. But, "France never yielded to this claim of ours." Oh, gladsome circumstance! It is time, then, that she did yield; and, in the mean while, the principle remains unshaken by the circumstance of our having neglected to force her to a compliance; a neglect, too, which at the time referred to, might have arisen from the particular connections, subsisting between the Kings of England and France. Selden, however, prescribes no such narrow limits; but asserts our right to dominion upon all the seas round about us, even unto the opposite shores; and not a mere "*sort of nominal*" dominion, but a real dominion, or ownership, including the right of opening, shutting, permitting, prohibiting, and demanding of tribute. And why, I ask again, are not the opinions and assertions of Selden as good, to the full, as the opinions and assertions of Grotius?—Against this doctrine of inequality, in point of rights, upon the seas, Sir William Scott is largely quoted; but, in the whole of the quotation, there is not one proposition hostile to the doctrine, for which I contend. He says, indeed, that he is to judge impartially; that he is to do by the Swedes, as he would wish the Swedes, in a similar case, to do by the British; but, acting fully up to these professions, he might have justified the searching of a Swedish flag ship for British seamen, and have denied a similar right to the Swedes; because we, having the dominion, or ownership of the sea, have a right thereon to do what other nations have not a right to do. Suppose Mr. Whitbread were to prosecute one of the lazy and vicious English labourers for carrying a gun in pursuit of game, and to make him pay a penalty of five pounds; and, suppose this man were, the next day, to prosecute Mr. Whitbread for carrying a gun, and were to find, that he would have for his pains the payment of the costs. Yet the result would be the same. All the difference would consist in the rights of the parties respective

ly. There is, however, no such thing as beating it into the head of the Morning Chronicle (I hope this is not *personal*), that there is, or has been, or ever can be, any difference between our rights and the rights of any other nation, upon the seas; and, in this article before us, he coolly concludes, as if upon admitted premises, that, "if the right of searching ships of war be claimed by us, it *must be conceded to the Americans*." Why it *must*, he does not, indeed, tell us, but goes unconcernedly on to observe, that, as the Americans have scarcely any ships of war, and as ours are very numerous, we should get but few men out of theirs, while they, in all probability, would get great numbers out of ours. Really, after this, one need not be much surprised to hear it contended, that, because the magistrate has the power to take up the vagrant upon suspicion, the vagrant ought to have the same power with respect to the magistrate, than which a more satisfactory proof of equality of rights could not, I think, be required, even by Lord Stanhope himself.—I agree, with Sir William Scott, that "the right of search must unquestionably be exercised with as little of personal harshness, and of vexation in the mode, as possible;" but, says the Morning Chronicle, "it is not very likely that it will be so exercised, when so much pains are taken to raise both the contempt and the hatred of our navy against the Americans."—This I take to myself, and am ready to justify it upon the best of all possible grounds, that of *truth* employed in defence of my country's interest and honour. I appeal to my readers, whether this very Morning Chronicle had not conveyed to the public the paragraphs, contained in the American papers, abusive of our officers and of our country, before I said a word upon the subject; whether those paragraphs did not contain charges of cowardice and villainy against our officers, and threats against us, unless we instantly submitted to the American demands; whether this Morning Chronicle, and a weekly writer, who now condescends to borrow its plumes and fight under its wings, had not openly espoused the cause of these our revilers, and, tacitly at least, approved of their revilings? I appeal to my readers, whether this be not true; and was it not, then, my duty to show to the public, and to other nations, as far as I might have a chance of succeeding therein, not only that the charges against us were false, but also of what character our accusers were, and what were the motives of their accusations? Very tender is the Morning Chronicle of the reputation

of the Americans and of Captain (I beg his pardon, *Commodore*, I mean) Barron; but, nothing chafed does it appear at hearing Admiral Berkeley denominated "a *piratical* commander in chief," Captain Humphreys "a *murderer*," and Captain Douglas, one of the best even of British naval officers, "an insolent *ruffian*." Let the Americans abuse us in their own prints as long as they please; but, as often as their abuse is circulated by the prints in England, and, through those prints, is likely to find its way to other countries, so often will I, though single-handed, use my best endeavours to furnish an antidote to the poison, and, if I am not successful, the fault, I am resolved, shall not be mine. If the consequence of my animadversions upon these American attacks, be that contempt and hatred, of which the Morning Chronicle so feelingly deprecates the effects, the fault be with the aggressor; for I have not yet brought myself to adopt the Quaker maxim, that it is the *second* blow which is most sinful, because it is that which makes the battle. My belief is, that pens as well as limbs, were given us for our defence, and that, if the attack be unjust, the defence is just. Suffer these aspersions, these bitter reproaches against us, to pass, in our own journals, unresented, and what is the consequence? Why, that the whole world will believe them to be just; or that we are so base and infamous become, that, from motives of party or of discontent at the conduct of our rulers, while many take delight in promulgating charges of foreigners against their country, there is not a man amongst us, who will move pen or tongue in its defence. I have a quarrel with abuses of all sorts; I have a quarrel with speculation and plunder, under whatever specious names they may be disguised; but, I have no quarrel with my country, which I live in hopes of seeing restored to all the liberties and blessings she formerly enjoyed. In all lawful endeavours to effect a reform of the destructive abuses that exist, "I will set my foot as far as he that goes farthest," in the way either of labour or of sacrifice; I have so done hitherto; but, I trust, that nothing will ever induce me to act as if I thought to escape from my share of the reproach, due to those abuses, by throwing the blame upon the country instead of throwing it upon those who ought to bestir themselves for the restoration of her liberties and renown. The Morning Chronicle may resent, as long as it pleases, my imputations of coldness towards the country; but, cold and abstracted I must say it is, upon all questions wherein the country is a party; and, I will further say,

that the whole of the *politicians*, belonging to the Whigs, have but too frequently discovered the same sort of feeling. It is but of late years that this feeling has crept in; this surprising *liberality*; this perfect *impartiality*. About four years ago, the editor of the *Booksellers' Annual Register* took occasion to remark that it was time to lay aside, the song of "*Britannia rule the waves*," as being *insulting* to foreign nations! And, it is truly curious, that this man's name was *Thompson*, whereunto he had, for the purpose, I suppose, of distinguishing himself from the immortal author of the song, prevailed, for what price I know not, upon the *learned gentlemen* of Edinburgh to add the title of *Doctor of Laws*. This proposition alone, published, as it was, in a book of wide circulation, is sufficient to stamp the character of the age. I am for our ruling the waves still, being confident, that, if we cease to do that, we shall soon be released from the trouble of ruling the land.

AMERICAN STATES.—The London prints have extracted from those of America, within these few days, several articles, which clearly show, that a considerable part of the people of that country are, as I said they would be, decidedly opposed to the assertion of those arrogant pretensions, of which the "*Revenge*," cutter is supposed to have been the bearer. One of these articles I cannot refrain from extracting. It is dated at Boston, August the 10th, and it will serve as a pretty tolerable good answer to all those, who have expressed such alarm at the prospect of a rupture with America.—"Some of our warm democratic papers, consider it a mere half-day's job to ruin Great Britain, and compel her to subscribe to such terms, as in our humanity we may condescend to offer. Were it as easy to do as to talk, we could have made England long ere this, one of the territories of the United States. Supposing, while they are making their calculations, we also make a few.—In the first place, it is agreed, that the war will be on the ocean, almost entirely: and on the ocean, let it be seriously enquired, how little we can gain, and how much we must lose. Great Britain will not hazard her produce and manufactures to the capture of our privateers. She will convoy together perhaps an hundred sail of merchantmen, by ten frigates, or even five. Can we capture them? No. We are to trade to the West Indies, to neutral ports, and to the ports of her enemies, says one paper; but how are they to be convoyed? Will our merchants pay our privateers for convoy? If

they should, it ought to be remembered, that individuals in England, will fit out privateers to match us, and will be backed by almost one thousand armed vessels of the government. Our underwriters would not demand a premium of less than fifty per cent. to insure to France, Spain, the Baltic, or the Mediterranean. And what would they demand to insure to the West Indies? Little less to the West Indies, after active engagement in war on both sides.—What prizes are we to take on the ocean? One privateer may take another; but few American privateers will take a single English merchantman. So far from the country's being enriched by privateering—so far from our having "700 respectable privateers," as our government paper declares, our owners of vessels could not fit out one hundred. They would want a prospect of success: they would rather, from economy, permit their vessels gradually to rot in their docks. Men engage not in privateering, seamen enlist not in privateering, without an expectation, a strong probability, of a balance of chances in their favour.—But the *Intelligencer* is told to say, that we are to receive an income equal to our revenue, from "700 respectable privateers." What idiot believes it? Yet, if it were so, it is no income to the government! How is our civil list to be paid? How our national debt decreased? Aye, but the democratic bawling for the necessity of lowering and banishing the national debt, entirely ceases, when we can hire money to ruin ourselves, to ruin the British, and to aggrandize France. We can "hire money:" we have now a "national established credit," and can hire money. We can afford to lose a revenue of a dozen millions of dollars, and run in debt yearly four millions. We once could not do so. For French or Spanish insults, or spoliations, or aggressions on our rights, our honour, or our territory, nothing could be done; not even provision made for 4000 men. The case is widely different. We see it is: England is the insulter now. The Spaniards, backed by the French, and because backed by the French, may shut the port of New Orleans; may keep us with an armed force from territory purchased; may carry off our citizens; may exact and receive duties at the Mobile, when our government years since by law established a custom-house to receive duties ourselves; may seize the military stores of the United States; may

“kick our Plenipos down the back stairs of
 “her ministers; in short, may do what she
 “pleases; and our executive, with mule-
 “like patience, takes the whips and kicks,
 “talks big in his messages, and tells his
 “private understrappers to talk little in the
 “House of Representatives; and all this
 “because Spain is France, and France,
 “Buonaparté, and Buonaparté is ———,
 “at the head of an “*enlightened govern-*
 “ment.”—We have no idea of succum-
 “bing to the insults or injuries of either na-
 “tion; nor do any but children and block-
 “heads declare so; nor any but children
 “and blockheads, believe, that those are
 ““*tories*,” or partial to Britain, because
 “they wish to avoid war, if consistent with
 “national honour, and our rights. Yet the
 “whole answer, and the whole argument
 “of certain democrats is, *tories*, *tories*, *to-*
 “*ries*. With far more truth could we say,
 “Frenchmen, Frenchmen, Frenchmen.—
 “The National Intelligencer says, we are
 “to make our fortunes by privateering,
 “should a war take place with G. Britain;
 “that its profits are to equal the present re-
 “venue of the country from foreign im-
 “ports; and that this immense sum, in-
 “stead of going into the national trea-
 “sury, is to flow into every man’s pock-
 “et. This is a charming picture of
 “the solid resources of a great coun-
 “try; and would be looked on with
 “some complacency, could the agricul-
 “turalist, whose surplus productions would
 “thereby be denied a market; could the
 “mechanic and artificer, whose labour
 “would cease, for want of employment;
 “could the merchant, whose commercial
 “speculations would entirely be suspended,
 “unless exercised at a risk, that would for-
 “bid even the hope of profit, be prevailed
 “on to think as he thinks, and act as he
 “advises.—The additional force ordered out
 “by the executive of this commonwealth
 “is, we understand, intended for the pur-
 “pose of preserving order, in case of riots,
 “illegal proceedings and disorders, and to
 “assist the magistracy, should such distur-
 “bances occur. It is often the case that
 “acts the most illegal and unjustifiable are
 “committed partly through violence, part-
 “ly through ignorance, but mostly from
 “the instigation of particular seditious tem-
 “pers and the writings of such scribblers
 “as are constantly endeavouring to disturb
 “the peace of the town, through the
 “Chronicle. This measure of the Com-
 “mander in Chief is prudent, and highly
 “praise-worthy.—The Intelligencer says,
 “we have “the highest authority the case

“admits of,” the President’s Proclamation,
 “to prove they were American citizens.
 “*With shame and with sorrow we say, we*
 “*have an executive in whom we wish we*
 “*could place more reliance.* We know
 “not but that they are American; but Ad-
 “miral Berkeley says NO in his Proclama-
 “tion. Why will not the Intelligencer ob-
 “tain from government *the documents* that
 “induced the President to *believe* them
 “Americans? They would give great sa-
 “tisfaction.”—My life upon it, they will
 “be found to be British subjects. I never be-
 “lieved the contrary, for one moment; and
 “this article confirms me in my first persua-
 “sion.—Party spirit may, for aught I know,
 “have had some influence with this writer;
 “but, his arguments are before us; of them
 “we can safely judge; and they tend to con-
 “firm all that I have said respecting the con-
 “sequences of a war to the American States.
 “—In vain would the American govern-
 “ment impose prohibitions with respect to
 “the supplying of our West-India Islands
 “with provisions and lumber. The people of
 “America would supply them in spite of all
 “prohibitions. They would clear their ships
 “out for other ports and go to ours. They
 “would agree with English privateers to cap-
 “ture them in such or such places. They
 “would evade all the laws, if hundreds were
 “made, upon the subject; or, not being able
 “to evade them, the States to the north (or,
 “as they call it there, to the east), would
 “openly set the general government at de-
 “fiance, and effect that *separation*, for
 “which some of them have long wished, and
 “which has even been proposed in print.—
 “Here, I think, the public mind seems to be
 “made up to war with America, rather than
 “yield the smallest particle of our rights to
 “her; and, indeed, the events, which have
 “recently taken place in Europe, so far from
 “rendering it advisable to yield in this respect,
 “must, unless the plans of the ministers be
 “partial and paltry, lead to an abridgement of
 “that liberty of navigation, which the Ame-
 “ricans have hitherto enjoyed upon the sea.
 “America is now the great trading neutral
 “power; the chief feeder of our foe; and,
 “though she is not to be blamed for thus con-
 “sulting her interests, we shall be compelled
 “to interfere with these her pursuits, or, we
 “shall soon fall under that foe. This is to be
 “done without a war, and even without a
 “quarrel. A declaration, on the part of the
 “king, applying equally to all neutral nations,
 “and stating broadly the necessity of exercis-
 “ing an absolute maritime dominion, until a
 “change should take place with respect to the
 “governing powers of those states of Europe

containing sea-ports and naval arsenals, would be quite sufficient to disarm of its power to do mischief the malignity of the Gallo-Americans. Such regulations as we ought to adopt, while they would most terribly annoy and distress our enemies, would do no injury at all to *the people* of America. Their goods, and their foreign freights, or a considerable part of them, might still find free passage; and all the difference would be, that our enemies would have to pay ten times as dear for them.—In a former article, I made some remarks upon the proclamation of the Corresponding Society of American Merchants, issued from their court at Liverpool; and, I am now glad to have it in my power to communicate to my readers, the answer to that proclamation, given by a committee of American merchants, assembled at the City of London Tavern on the 21st of August, and which answer, prefaced by a letter from one of those merchants, will be found in a subsequent page of this sheet. This answer does great credit to the persons, by whom it was given; it pretty fully justifies my opinion of the proclamation; and, I hope, that the reception it has met with will tend to make the court at Liverpool less arrogant in its tone, upon future occasions. To say the truth, the sovereigns of that court received their impulse from the Morning Chronicle and Mr. Whitbread. They were alarmed for the safety of their cargoes and their debts, compared with which the honour and even the lives of Admiral Berkeley and his officers were in their eyes, mere trifles.—I think, for my part, that it would be best to have no treaty of commerce at all with America. I cannot see any good that it could possibly lead to. Let trade alone. I warrant the merchants will find out the way to carry it on between our several settlements and countries. The shackles upon the American trade with our West Indies are injurious to those colonies, without producing any benefit to our navigation. The main object is to prevent our *foes* from receiving, either directly or indirectly, through the means of the American ships, any supply of any sort, without paying an enormous price for them. While those foes have hundreds of American merchant ships in their service, they want none of their own; but, take these away, or load the supplies with heavy taxes (for every check operates as a tax), and the distress must be severely felt. Suppose all American ships, bound to France, or to any country under the dominion of France, were brought into our ports and taxed according to the value of her cargo; the consequence

would be, that the consumers, when the cargo finally reached them, must pay that tax. “No catch you, no have you;” but, as no one would be sure to escape, all must *insure*, and that of itself, would be a tax to be paid by the consumer.—If, indeed, there be any idea still in vogue of trucking for dear Hanover, I am amusing myself with a dream; and, I see that Napoleon has kept dear Hanover in hand as an object of exchange. I fear that this will be the case, and that we shall soon hear the hireling prints, softening their tone gradually, tell us at last, that he is become *more moderate* in his views; and next, upon his evacuating some pitiful territories in the north of Europe, opening the Elbe again, and restoring Hanover, under the guarantee of Russia and Prussia, or some such nonsense, it is safe to make peace with him. This I predict will be the result of all the high language and apparent vigour of the day. I shall be glad to find myself deceived; but, *looking at the past*, I cannot but entertain these fears, so often expressed. Again and again I say, that I fear, that these ministers will do, what the Whigs proved their readiness to do, sacrifice the safety of England to the recovery of Hanover; and, if they do, it will be then evident to every man, that those who love their country have but *one way left* to provide for its security, and to prevent themselves from becoming slaves of France.—Just as I was about to enter upon my next article, the following paragraph, extracted from a Halifax (Nova Scotia Paper), dated on the 17th of July, reached me through the London prints.—“Commodore Barron is said to have assured Captain Humphries, that his orders from his own government were to *receive no deserters*, and that there were not any men in his ship who answered the description; though it afterwards appeared that more than 120 British seamen were on board her at the time, most of whom had been recently in his Majesty’s service. An officer (gunner) who was killed, had been *enticed* to desert from the Chichester; and two seamen who fell, but whose names do not appear in the American accounts, were deserters from the Halifax. J. Wilson alias Jenkin Ratford, who was taken out of the Chesapeake, had been master sail-maker in the Halifax, and, as a British seaman, had received 20 guineas bounty on entering on board that ship when in this harbour. W. Ward, D. Martin, and J. Strawn, alias Story, also taken from the Chesapeake, were deserters from the Melampus, and

“ have since declared that there were more
 “ than 100 British seamen in the American
 “ frigate, deserters from his Majesty’s ships
 “ on this station, and from British merchant
 “ vessels, who were not taken out by Capt.
 “ Humphreys, because his officers could
 “ not identify them. — The American
 “ Papers mention only 3 men killed and 13
 “ wounded : the truth is, that 6 men were
 “ killed, and 21 wounded ; and it is obvious
 “ for what reason the numbers were thus
 “ mistated. The men whose names are
 “ omitted were proved to have been deser-
 “ ters from the British navy ; and one of
 “ them, the officer (gunner), lately from
 “ the Chichester. — These facts being
 “ well ascertained, the candid reader, in
 “ America or any other part of the world,
 “ may be left to draw his own conclusion—
 “ whether commodore Barron has acted
 “ consistently with the orders of his govern-
 “ ment ; or whether, forgetting his digni-
 “ fied situation, he has stooped to evade and
 “ prevaricate.” — Now, if this statement
 be true, and I am strongly inclined to think
 it is so, away go all the American lies, and
 away go, too, all the fine calculations of the
 Morning Chronicle about the “ trifling
 “ number of seamen” whom we should lose
 by a forbearance such as it so strongly re-
 commends for our adoption. I know how
 the American captains and news-papers will
 disfigure facts ; I know that they will stick at
 no falsehoods ; and I know that, on the part
 of our officers, heretofore, there has been
 but too much inclination to forego the ex-
 ercise of their country’s rights, in all cases
 where the Americans have been a party.
 I could mention the names of some,
 whom the Americans have recently dis-
 graced by their praises, who appeared
 to me much more anxious about their money,
lodged in the American funds, than about
 the interests of England. Admiral Berkeley
 and his captains have shown a different dis-
 position ; and, I trust, they will receive
 the support of the ministry and the gratitude
 of the country.

DANISH WAR.—The only part of the
 king’s Declaration (inserted below), relative
 to his conduct towards Denmark, that I
 could wish had been omitted, is that wherein
 he speaks of *information*, which he had
 received with respect to the intentions of
 France. Of this information every one will
 form his own judgment ; but, if the mea-
 sure had rested upon the ground of *notoriety*
 and *necessity*, there would have been no
 room for any difference of opinion, which
 did not before exist. The introduction of
 this private information would seem to im-

ply, that there remained a *doubt* as to the
 manifest intentions of Napoleon, and, of
 course, a doubt as to the necessity of the
 measure ; which doubt ought not, in my
 opinion, to have been excited ; for, I do
 not believe, that it existed before. — There
 has been much ranting upon the subject of
 the sufferings of the “ unoffending Danes ;”
 but, how could we avoid causing those suf-
 ferings, without abandoning the object ?
 And here again we come to the original
 question of necessity. Upon this question
 I will just ask : do you, Sir, the editor of
 the Morning Chronicle believe, that, if this
 measure had not been taken, we should not
 have seen a confederacy of Russia and Den-
 mark, sufficient to have taken forty thousand
 men on board, and to have kept employed
 forty sail of our line of battle ships with a
 proportionate number of smaller vessels ?
 Do you not believe this ? I should like a
yea, or a *nay*, to this question : and, if you
 say *yea*, if you say that you do not believe
 it, and if you speak sincerely, then is your
 conduct upright ; but otherwise it is not.

—The circumstance, too, mentioned in
 the Declaration, that the Danes pleaded the
 over-awing influence of France, in 1801,
 for entering into a similar confederacy,
 though in defiance of a positive treaty with
 us, is conclusive in justification of the pre-
 sent measure ; and, with the knowledge of
 this fact, the ministers would have been
 guilty of the blackest treason, and would
 have deserved to lose their lives, infinitely
 more than Despard deserved to lose his life,
 if they had not acted in the manner they
 have done. — What may be the real inten-
 tions of Russia *now* I know just as much as
 the writers in London appear to know ; but,
 she seems to have been staggered. I hope,
 however, that this operation of ours will not
 lead to a renewal of the war in the north of
 Europe, with all its curses of embassies and
 subsidies and commissaries and aides-de-camp
 and new plunder upon us. The Emperors
 of the East and of the West have got the
 continent between them ; let them keep it,
 till they are disposed, through the means
 of our naval exertions, to give up some of
 the countries, having ports and arsenals,
 and their possession of which is dangerous
 to England. We have the full power of
 producing this disposition in their minds ;
 and, if, for the sake of Hanover, or any
 such paltry object, we stop short of produc-
 ing it, we ought to perish, and our name
 be blotted out of the catalogue of nations.
 —The Morning Chronicle, in reverting
 to the subject of the Danish expedition, says
 “ we are not *here* before an impartial tribu-

nal." And is this, Sir, the way, in which you get rid of the question? Is it true, that the *public* here are *always* on the side of the ministry, and so determined in this their partiality, as to render it useless to endeavour to put them right? This certainly is not the case; and, if it were, why not, at once, cease your endeavours upon *all* political questions? No; it is only, you will say, where the *advantage* of a measure is *apparently* in favour of the country, that the public are not impartial; but, why not endeavour, then, to convince them that it is not really so? They will, surely, hear you? The fact is, Sir, you are in a curious dilemma here; for, in this declaration of yours, you have tacitly allowed, either that the measure was *manifestly* advantageous to the country; or, that, not being so, you are incapable of making the contrary appear.

POOR LAWS.—Another Scotch correspondent has favoured me with his remarks (which will be found in another page of this sheet) upon the parochial-school subject, or rather upon my observation thereon. He sets out in the true style of Sir Archy Mc Sarcasm, which I should be very willing to forgive, if he offered me any thing to the point, accompanied with his personal reflections. His quotation of the opinion of Lord Buchan has no weight with me, being worth much about as much as the estimates of Gregory King, who was so minute as to include the number of *rabbits* in the kingdom. Does Sir Archy think, that the official documents that I refer to, and my calculations and arguments founded upon those documents, are to be answered by producing the mere random guess of a person, who, for aught I know, might be half mad? The "*colonies*", settled by Scotch labourers, of which he talks, are mere clusters of hovels, inhabited by people who seldom taste any thing but fish and potatoes.—Sir Archy, too, following the example of Scoto Britannus, takes no notice of the grants annually made to the industrious and virtuous Scotch labourers out of the taxes, raised from the labour of the lazy and vicious English labourers. This is a point which they appear to shun with as much care as a sailor shuns the rocks. What! take the fruit of English labourers and give it to *make work* for Scotch labourers, in order to enable the latter to live in their own country, and then come to that same wise assembly which is the instrument in the donation, and propose to it to declare (quite unnecessarily), that the former ought to look to the latter as an example of *industry*! Nothing, surely, was every so outrageously impudent and insolent

as this!—Sir Archy assumes that I am the aggressor in this dispute; and so I should be, had not Mr. Whitbread framed his famous preamble, and *confessedly*, too, upon the authority of Scotchmen. This being the case, they are the aggressors, and I think myself as much bound to resent their insults levelled against England, as I think myself bound to resent the insults of the Americans or the French. Since they have insulted us, too, they must not be surprized, if I go farther in showing, that Scotland, by one means or another, has been, and is, greatly favoured, in other respects, at the expence of England and Ireland. My wish is to drop the subject where it is; but, if new provocations are offered, they will, assuredly, be met, and in a way that Sir Archy, with all his vindictive sneers, would, I imagine, be but little able to withstand.

EXPATRIATION OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

—This topic must be deferred 'till my next. It is important, not because it is likely that any law, or declaration, such as is recommended by my correspondent, in page 433, will ever be made, or seriously thought of; but, because the recommendation tends to show how anxious some amongst us are to be at perfect liberty to pursue their own interests at the expence of those of their country.—My other correspondent, in page 506, has given a good answer, upon general principles; but, I do not think, that he has gone enough into detail; and, I am pretty certain that he is not fully aware of all the motives which dictated the recommendation of S. V. nor with all the consequences, to which the adoption of it would lead.

PORTUGAL.—Great alarm seems to be entertained respecting this state. The *factors* are, it appears, packing up their alls, ready to decamp at a moment's warning; and so, if we believe the wise men of the daily prints, are the *government* of Portugal! Was there ever any thing so foolish as this in the world! A whole *government* emigrating! The *Queen* and *Prince* might, indeed, be able to emigrate; and, even they, I am afraid, would lose their reckoning, and get to *England* instead of the *Brazils*; but, for a whole government, with all its constituted authorities, and all its *powers*, to emigrate, is surely, the wildest idea that ever entered into a sick brain.—If the Portuguese government be a good one; if the rulers are wise and considerate towards the people; if the people enjoy the fair fruits of their labour, it will be melancholy to behold, or to hear of, its overthrow; but, if just the

contrary be the case, the event will not give me much pain. As I know nothing about the government of Portugal, I cannot, at present, venture to give any opinion, or express any wish upon the subject, other than that I do not think Napoleon can do us, the mass of the people of England, any harm in that quarter.

AMERICAN STATES.

SIR;—In your paper of the 22d ult. No. 8, Vol XII, in your letter to the Independent Electors of Westminster you have inserted certain resolutions, and a circular letter, from the American chamber of commerce at Liverpool, accompanied with observations which convey an opinion, that, the mercantile body generally would be ready to join in the cry which that publication was intended to excite; I have not heard of its effects in other parts of the kingdom, but I inclose a resolution of the committee of American merchants in London, passed on the 21st of the same month probably at the very time you were writing your letter, which I hope you will, with your usual candour, take an early opportunity of presenting to your readers. This resolution does not imply, that that body were ready upon the impulse of the moment to join their brethren at Liverpool in a cry in favour of the particular interests of the mercantile body in preference to objects of greater political importance. These important objects are in other hands, and I hope will be attended to with the respect due to an independent, although a young state. I also hope there is no intelligent merchant trading to America so ignorant of the national character, and of circumstances there, as not to know, that his true interest is to strengthen the hands of his own government by any means in his power, and that promptitude, and vigour in our councils, are essentially necessary, most especially in the present moment.—A MERCHANT.

"City of London Tavern. Friday, August 21.—At a meeting of the committee of American Merchants. Philip Sansom, Esq. in the chair;"

"The chairman stated, that he had received a letter from John Richardson, Esq. Vice-President of the American chamber of commerce, at Liverpool, accompanying certain resolutions of that board, and their circular letter, dated the 11th inst.; the same having been read, it was

"Resolved unanimously, That this committee will be at all times happy to receive any communications from the American

"chamber of commerce, at Liverpool, which may have a tendency to promote the commercial intercourse between the British Empire and the United States of America, but with the knowledge that negotiations of great political importance are pending between the Government of this country and the American states, they are of opinion, that any interference on their part, at the present moment, would be improper; and this committee having no reason to believe his Majesty's Government to be indisposed to an amicable accommodation of the present differences, see no necessity for associations being formed in the different manufacturing towns and seaports, for the purpose of collecting information as to the prospects of a good understanding, or otherwise, between the two countries." But if it should at any time appear that the efforts of this committee can be useful in promoting cordiality and harmony between the two Governments, they will be ready to do every thing in their power for the attainment of so desirable an object.—

"John Gray, Secretary."

DANISH WAR.

SIR,—At a moment when the event of the Danish expedition was yet uncertain, and that portion of our venal diurnal press devolved to administration, justified the measure by speculations, which (whimsically enough) one day charged upon the Danes an intended junction with the French, and on the morrow contained grave intimation that our fleet and army had been invited by the Danish court to garrison their capital, and place their navy beyond the reach of the iron grasp of Buonaparté; you, with that manly decision which forms a feature equally prominent and honourable in your character, bestowed on the project a warm and hearty approbation, upon the plain and intelligible ground, that the measure was necessary for the national safety, and as such fit to be adopted. I profess to follow the opinions of no man to the extent of an unqualified surrender of my own; and on this occasion in totally differing from you, experience all that a person may be supposed to feel, differing from another for whose understanding and integrity he entertains the highest respect. I with you am ready to uphold "the antient rights and practices of England upon the seas," and most cordially consign to execration that minister who shall waive one iota of them; but I am unable to found a justification of the Danish expedition upon any "right," nor, happily, does the

British history afford an instance "in practice," of a similar conduct to any neutral nation under the canopy of Heaven. There are a class of persons who judge of all things by the event! With these gentlemen reasoning is thrown away! And there is another order of men whom I have as little inclination to trouble, I mean those profound politicians who hold for nothing all principles of good faith and integrity, when opposed to national advantage. An ingenious writer of the present day, in the following passage, has admirably described these sages, and from his pen I give you the well coloured picture. "When a measure is shewn to
 " them to be wicked, it is more than half
 " proved to be wise. Nay, their artificial
 " taste, like other unnatural propensities,
 " often acquires greater strength and more
 " powerful domination over reason and prudence, than the natural one it has supplanted could ever have attained. If philanthropy has its enthusiasts, political immorality has its devotees, not so ardent indeed, but more than equally blind and irrational. There are fanatics in the school of Machiavel, as well as in that of Rousseau." I, for my part, profess to write neither to fools or knaves. My address is to men, who like you have no party but their country. If this (I trust no inconsiderable) portion of the nation, hold by their integrity, the country may yet be saved; but if they, the best hope and stay of Britain, become converts to the doctrine of expediency, the period is not far distant when their characters will be most deservedly brought on a level with those they most condemn. Once broadly admit the principle, "that national injustice may be the source of national benefit," and the doctrine of expediency will overwhelm you as a flood. At home, no matter what the form of the constitution might be in substance, the government of Great Britain would become as despotic as that of Turkey, and our power from (heretofore as in happier times) protecting the freedom, would degenerate into the scourge of Europe: and form, not "a northern," but a "universal confederacy," grafted on the only principle that ever yet held a confederacy together; that of self-defence, and a common interest. Nations like individuals are assailed by their necessities, temptations arise, checks are requisite, and laws assented to for mutual preservation; and perilous is the situation of that people, who without "an extreme necessity" shall presume to remove these landmarks of the nations of the earth. And upon this case of "extreme necessity fairly made out," rests

in my apprehension the justification or condemnation of the Danish expedition. For, as to the "glory" resulting from approaching the shores of an unsuspecting neutral, surprising him in the hour of profound peace, and by the aid of a superior and irresistible armament bombarding his capital and seizing his fleet; though that (since the success of the attack has been announced) has taken fast hold of the mind of the editor of the Morning Post; yet this feeling I am inclined to hope is almost exclusively his own—That Napoleon acknowledges no restraints as opposed to his interests, is unquestionably certain; and, that if so disposed, Denmark must have bowed to his yoke, I think probable. But that Russia would have consented to his holding the key of the Baltic, or he, without her assent would have taken such a step, appears of all things least likely. Napoleon, unfortunately for mankind, at once knows and follows his interest; his politics at present court Russia; he has much to do "with her" before he begins to "act against her;" add to which, if Napoleon appreciates the Danish fleet at the price we appear to set upon it, I think he will be found to reason less acutely than past experience has shewn him in the habit of doing. The situation of Denmark in common with her neighbours Sweden and Russia, is by no means favourable for great and successful maritime exertion; for a large portion of the year their fleets are confined by the ice to their own ports; their seamen though brave and hardy, unused to naval tactics have never ranked high. Moor them fast in line, and they will fire and be fired at till they are knocked to pieces; but afloat they are little formidable. Let me appeal on this point to every man who saw the Russian navy, when under the infatuated policy of Mr. Pitt they were brought on our coasts, to receive the benefit (at our expence) of the instruction and example of our own incomparable marine, or to the more recent instance which occurred in the action between a Danish frigate, and his Majesty's ship *Comus*. A further disadvantage occurs from their local position rendering the Baltic peculiarly liable to the inconveniences of a blockade. If acquiring the hulls of the Danish navy was an object worth putting the character of the British nation to the hazard, I am satisfied it was not an object Napoleon would have risked much to obtain. With the permission of Russia, he would have thought them dearly bought at the expence of throwing into our lap the commerce and colonies of the Danes. If mere ships could wrest from us the trident of the main, our

naval superiority would be short indeed; but our naval greatness rests on no such basis. The forests of Napoleon may yield timber, and the extent of his population afford abundant supplies of ship-builders; but this is a first and very short step to a powerful marine. Deficient in seamen, and deficient in officers, he may send out fleets to be dispersed by tempests, or defeated by our squadrons, a fate I am justified in predicting from the uniform result of every expedition that has left his ports during the present war. Our safety, thank God, does not depend on the possession of the hulls of a dozen Danish seventy fours, and as many frigates; nor does the importance of that possession in my mind, justify the measure by which it has been attained. The policy of Pitt, his constitutional buttresses, his commercial nobility, his bloated system of paper credit (so repeatedly and powerfully denounced by your energetic pen), have been a fruitful source of much suffering and disgrace; but, I deny that we are so broken down as to be reduced to the humiliation of avowing in the face of all Europe that our existence depends on a breach of those laws which hold together the frame of the civilized world. This were, indeed, to yield a base homage to the power of Napoleon, and drink of the cup of shame to the very dregs! Objecting as I do to the principle of the measure, the mode of its execution is with me a very secondary consideration. I am disposed to leave that question to the Post and the Chronicle; but, I own I am unfortunate enough here again once more to differ with you; near a fortnight was wasted before the attack was made, and when the enemy were reduced to an utter incapacity to further resist, a capitulation was granted, by which Denmark retains her seamen, and we stipulate 6 weeks to abandon his territory; and, already (if the public prints deserve credit) it has been found "expedient" to dispatch Capt. Cathcart with instructions "to extend" our possession.—Aye; Sir, extend our possession in the very teeth of the terms we have so recently granted.—Sir, these are means little calculated to save the country; the vile press are entertaining us with a negotiation for peace. I do not believe the report, nor do I believe (making all due allowances for difference of opinion among sensible and well-informed men,) that one man in 100 of that description in the United Kingdom, imagine a safe peace to be a practicable measure. We are embarked in a severe contest, the continuation of which, I do not hesitate to declare, must in all human probability, be at least commensurate with

the life of Napoleon. Vast exertions and great sacrifices must be made. The country must find its safety in high principles, and that magnanimous spirit which never yet existed where they were wanting. A reform founded on "the antient rights of Britons," and carried into effect agreeable to the "practice" of the British constitution, will in "our generation" enable us to abide "the pitiless pelting" of the utmost rage of the storm that howls around us, and hand down to posterity a monarchy powerful and permanent. A nobility antient and honourable. A nation loyal and free. Or if destined to perish in the mighty conflict, let us fall as becomes our honour, without one unseemly wound, as fits the descendants of that ancestry from whence we are sprung:

As to Sebastian, let them search the field;
And where they find a mountain of the slain,
Send one to climb, and looking down beneath,
There they will find him at his manly length,
With his face up to heaven, in that red monument
Which his good sword had digged!

AN OLD ENGLISHMAN.

Sept. 26, 1807.

AMERICAN STATES.

SIR;—You are the only man, who has publicly expressed sentiments hostile to an arrangement in our dispute with the American States, unless it should be on terms which, I am afraid, our government is as little inclined to demand, as the Americans to grant.—Your opinions on this, as on most other subjects, is, as far as my observation goes, completely popular. A war with America, is not only wished for, but is looked upon by many, as a measure that would be ultimately beneficial to this country.—A comparison of the relative situations of the two countries, seems to offer every argument in support of this doctrine. Every body knows, that the rapid progress the Americans have made, is solely owing to the undisturbed repose with which they have been permitted to carry on their internal improvements; and to the safety with which, from our forbearance, they have prosecuted their commerce with the different European States at war. They enriched themselves at a time when the means of subduing their enemies alone occupied the attention of other nations. Their success has made them insolent, and nothing will now satisfy them but that we must yield up rights which we ought never to abandon. These rights, the proud legacies, handed down to us after having been obtained in many a well fought battle, we are now asked to surrender, although we never were

in a better situation to maintain them. But, Sir, I hope the government of this country are determined to preserve them entire in spite of every consideration, and if the Americans are not contented let them take war, the only other alternative that will be likely to please them. I am, however, well convinced, that matters would not be allowed to proceed thus far. Were we to shew a determination to support our rights, they would be very willing to accommodate the business in any way we might choose. I should be glad to know what resistance a raw and selfish government, with instruments despicable in the eyes of all nations, could oppose to British exertion under active and energetic management? What would be the issue of a war commenced against the greatest maritime power on the globe, by a people whose political existence depends upon foreign commerce, and particularly that part of it which is derived from being the carriers betwixt belligerent nations? Is it for a country relatively circumstanced as we are, to surrender rights which are the sources of our naval superiority, and which have been formerly enforced and maintained against the united efforts of the principal maritime states in Europe? These are questions which, I believe will be answered in one way only. We should not concede a single point in dispute that is not incompatible with our safety and honour. I never could see any good reason for permitting the Americans to be of so much consequence in the political scale. They enjoy a pre-eminence which they shew themselves wholly unworthy of possessing, and had their insolence been treated in the manner which it deserved, we should not at this day have to carry on a negotiation in which, I am afraid, not only the interests, but also the honour of the country runs the hazard of being disregarded. I never experienced any other feeling than that of contempt for the late measures of the American government. The House of Representatives are worthy the people represented. Every thing is conducted with *so much candour, moderation, and dignity*. The non-importation act, and the manner in which it was passed, were truly characteristic of these qualities. Never were legislators so disgraced as were the Americans on that occasion. That measure both on account of the temper and spirit with which it was conducted, will long remain a striking monument of madness and fanaticism. Ministers in allowing this famous act to pass unnoticed, were guilty of a great sacrifice of the dignity of this country, holding as they did the means of enforcing instant redress

had these means but been resorted to. But consideration, it seems, for the interest of a few individuals who are engaged in the American trade, prevented their recourse to strong measures. No man who feels the love of his country yet unextinguished, can repress indignation when he sees its honour bartered for such pitiful ends. Would it have been believed in former times, that the government of Great Britain was to have been influenced by the meeting of some traders at the London Tavern? I believe all reasonable men will agree, that political considerations are of vastly greater importance than any commercial ones whatever; because the last have a reference to individuals only, the first to the community at large. The period is in all probability approaching, when necessity will enforce the conviction of this truth. We must give up part of our commerce for our political existence. As long as France domineers on the continent, our obvious policy is to deprive her and the countries under her controul of every external communication. This would bear hard against the Americans, Danes, &c. but the situation in which we are placed, completely justifies a measure that would be otherwise harsh and unjust.—
R. M.—Sept. 15, 1807.

POOR LAWS.

SIR,—In reading your Political Register, I frequently meet with much good information, and, at all times, a vast deal of entertainment. It astonishes me to observe that, whether you happen to be on the right or wrong side of a subject, you are never at a loss for stout argument, and an abundant display of oratorical parrying. You certainly have good bottom, as they call it, Mr. Cobbet; for, give you never such a mauling to day, by Saturday again you are at it *tooth and nail*, and with as much courage and sans-froid as if you felt nothing at all of your bruises. Upon this redoubtable bottom of yours, you seem to place your chief confidence; and well you may do so, provided you be in that quarter equally unsusceptible of blushing, as you are in the non-sanguiferous lineaments of your frontispiece.—It was only yesterday it came to my turn to peruse your Register of Saturday se'night, in which, I find a miscellaneous paper containing remarks upon Mr. Whitbread's proposed alteration on the poor laws.—This paper may well be, in my opinion, called a *miscellaneous* one; for, truly, Mr. Cobbett, you throw about you in all directions. You make a violent *thrust* at Mr. Whitbread; give the reviewers a *chopper*, and have *knocked down* a million and a half of my poor countrymen.

With the burden of Atlas on your back, you are, at the same time, the greatest Hector I ever heard of. Not contented in adding America to the list of your enemies, you seem also to have no objections to end a truce with this peaceable part of the creation. But, go on, Mr. Cobbett, you know exceedingly well how to earn your bread and butter. And if you will only allow us fair play, be assured, we shall never propose to gag you. I wish, then, to correct you in a few points that you have either mis-stated, or not stated at all, respecting this *here* country. You say, that "the taxes, raised annually in Scotland amount to something less than one-seventeenth of the taxes raised in Great Britain," and that, "the population of Scotland amounts to something less than one-seventh of the population of Great Britain." And then, by your ready arithmetic, you tell us sneeringly, that "each person in England, (including Wales) each of these lazy vicious English, pays to the state annually much more than double the sum that is paid by each of those industrious and moral Scotch, of whom our labourers, &c. &c." Why so much irony, Mr. Cobbett? You will surely grant me that, according to the present system of taxation in Great Britain, every man pays (at least, as much so as possible) in proportion to his circumstances and situation in life. If two persons worth a thousand pounds each, pay together a hundred pounds in taxes, while another person worth two thousand pounds pays as much as both of them, have they not all equal credit for their contributions? May they not be all equally intelligent, equally useful, equally honourable members of the state, although towards the support of it one of them pays twice as much as the other two individually? Just so it is with Scotland. Our means when compared with England, are not in proportion to our population. But there is something more to be said on the subject, and I must request of you to take notice of the rapidity with which we have been improving for the last century. Lord Buchan says, (and I think the opinion of a strong anti-unionist may be pretty safely trusted) that "at the Union of England and Scotland, England is supposed to have been superior to Scotland as thirty to one in landed revenue, and forty to one in *general opulence*." Now, Sir, if in the course of a hundred years, we have from such a state of diminutiveness improved our resources, so as to enable us to pay a seventeenth part of the taxes for the support of our government, by applying one of your own rules in arithmetic, I find that this little nation of fifteen

hundred thousand souls, should be capable in seventy four years hence, to pay a sum equal to England, "the *great nation*," with eight millions of rich subjects. I am surprised, Mr. Cobbett, to hear you talk so insidiously of Scotch industry. You say "you have seen colonies that have been settled by Englishmen, and some by Irishmen, but you never saw a country settled and cleared by the labour of Scotchmen." This, Mr. Cobbett, is not like your usual candour, for, although you may never have *seen* countries cleared by Scotchmen, you certainly must have *heard* of such places as Prince Edward's Island, near the coast of Nova Scotia, New Galloway in the state of New York in America, and many more, cultivated and inhabited by Scotchmen entirely. I cannot understand why you should have spoken in this manner, unless with a view to impress upon the minds of the *rich*, rather than the *poor*, that education has a tendency to give a people idle habits and to make them aspire to situations incompatible with the general interests of a nation. But depend upon it those notions are erroneous; no doubt, a person with some education will very soon acquire an ascendancy over those that have none, but where all are nearly on an equality in this respect, there is no lawful occupation whatever but what will be filled even by persons who can read and write the English language very well. You never were in Scotland, I suspect, Mr. Cobbett. Should you come to this part of the country, it would give me much happiness to meet with you. And I shall engage to shew you Journeymen Butchers at their masters' stalls, and labourers working at the public roads, who can read and write as well as you can do.—I don't mean to say that they are able to *hammer* at hard words, or to *cut up a review* in such a style as Mr. Cobbett, I only allude to what may be called the mechanical part of their scholarship; yet these men are happy and contented, and perhaps not one in a thousand ever thinks of out-bounding his useful sphere.—I do admire, as much as any one, the good nature, the many virtues, and, generally speaking, the comfortable state, of the people of England.—In several good things they are greatly before my country, particularly in cleanliness, which coming with propriety under the name of a domestic excellence, to the merit of it, I think your females are best entitled.—But in this respect, I am glad to say, we are also mending very fast.—And now, give me leave, Mr. Cobbett, to lay before you something like a comparative statement of the crimes committed in both countries.

—I have heard an affirmation made, and I believe it cannot be refuted, that take the whole number of criminals executed in Scotland in the last twenty years (including foreigners) they will not average in a year more than seven or eight. Need I say any thing of your Newgate Calendar? I think I may safely aver that in one County in England, with a population of three hundred thousand, there are more capital crimes committed annually, than in all Scotland in two years—And I have seen such hellish scenes in Lancashire, in their mode of fighting there, as, I am sure, would have chilled the blood of Rob Roy. Such feelings and conduct in Caledonians you surely will not attribute to any national timidity or want of valour. Without partiality I am rather inclined to place them to the credit of general education, and consequently, a general amelioration on the ruder passions of the mind in all classes of the community.—I am, Sir, &c.—A SAWNEY.—*Peterhead.* September 11, 1807.

DOMESTIC OFFICIAL PAPER.

DENMARK.—*Declaration of the King of Great Britain, relative to the War with Denmark, dated Westminster, September 25, 1807.*

His Majesty owes to himself and to Europe a frank exposition of the motives which have dictated his late measures in the Baltic. His Majesty has delayed this exposition only in the hope of that more amicable arrangement with the Court of Denmark, which it was his Majesty's first wish and endeavour to obtain; for which he was ready to make great efforts and great sacrifices, and of which he never lost sight even in the moment of the most decisive hostility.—Deeply as the disappointment of this hope has been felt by his Majesty, he has the consolation of reflecting, that no exertion was left untried on his part to produce a different result. And while he laments the cruel necessity which has obliged him to have recourse to acts of hostility against a nation with which it was his Majesty's most earnest desire to have established the relations of common interest and alliance; his Majesty feels confident that, in the eyes of Europe and of the world, the justification of his conduct will be found in the commanding and indispensable duty, paramount to all others amongst the obligations of a sovereign, of providing, while there was yet time, for the immediate security of his people. His Majesty had received the most positive information of

the determination of the present ruler of France to occupy, with a military force, the territory of Holstein, for the purpose of excluding Great Britain from all her accustomed channels of communication with the continent; of inducing or compelling the court of Denmark to close the passage of the Sound against the British commerce, and navigation; and of availing himself of the aid of the Danish marine for the invasion of Great Britain and Ireland. Confident as his Majesty was of the authenticity of the sources from which this intelligence was derived, and confirmed in the credit which he gave to it, as well by the notorious and repeated declarations of the enemy, and by his recent occupation of the towns and territories of other neutral states, as by the preparations actually made for collecting a hostile force upon the frontiers of his Danish Majesty's continental dominions, his Majesty would yet willingly have forborne to act upon this intelligence, until the complete and practical disclosure of the plan had been made manifest to all the world. His Majesty did forbear, as long as there could be a doubt of the urgency of the danger, or a hope of an effectual counteraction to it, in the means or in the dispositions of Denmark.—But his Majesty could not but recollect, that when, at the close of the former war, the court of Denmark engaged in a hostile confederacy against Great Britain, the apology offered by that court for so unjustifiable an abandonment of a neutrality which his Majesty had never ceased to respect, was founded on its avowed inability to resist the operation of external influence, and the threats of a formidable neighbouring power. His Majesty could not but compare the degree of influence which at that time determined the decision of the court of Denmark, in violation of positive engagements, solemnly contracted but six months before, with the increased operation which France had now the means of giving to the same principle of intimidation, with kingdoms prostrate at her feet, and with the population of nations under her banners.—Nor was the danger less eminent than certain. Already the army destined for the invasion of Holstein was assembling on the violated territory of neutral Ham-burgh, and, Holstein once occupied, the island of Zealand was at the mercy of France, and the navy of Denmark at her disposal.—It is true, a British force might have found its way into the Baltic, and checked for a time the movements of the Danish marine. (To be continued.)